The Brethren Evangelist

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT

The Brethren Publishing House,
ASHLAND, OHIO.

J. W. BEER, Editor, Altamont, Cal.
J. D. McFADEN, As't., Philadelphia, Pa
E. L. YODER, E. MASON, A. L. GARBER, } **Directors and Associate Editors.**

The Editor and Assistant Editor hold themselves responsible only for what appears over their own signatures, the duties of acting editor resting upon the manager of the Publishing House.

Terms of Subscription.

One Copy one year,	**1.50**
One Copy six month,	**.75**
One Copy four months,	**.50**

Send Money by Express, Postal Money Order, Draft, or Registered Letter, payable to the order of A. L. Garber. One and 2-cent stamps will be accepted for sums under one dollar only; we much prefer Postal Notes to stamps, but both are at the risk of the sender. **Do not send cash in an unregistered letter.**

Examine the date printed on your paper with your name, and when you time is out please renew. **A change of the date is a sufficient receipt for subscriptions,** and if the date is not changed in two weeks after payment is made, notify us of the error.

ADDRESS,
THE BRETHREN PUB. HOUSE,
ASHLAND, Ashland Co., OHIO

ASHLAND COLLEGE SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent to this office, and the proper credit will be given, and due acknowledgements made.

ASHLAND, Ohio, Nov. 7, 1888.

An Apology.

During the three years past all the cares and responsibilities of publishing this paper has rested upon me, and in addition I have borne many of the cares connected with the maintenance of the College, to the great detriment to this business and efficiency of this paper.

Now I expect to spend some time in doing what I can to assist in raising the $2,500 yet needed to make the first payment, and must therefore abandon the paper and the business here, and commit it to the care of the office hands. If, therefore, there should be unusual lacks in the paper and failure to attend to business matters, be pleased to exercise Gospel Charity, and make due allowances.

A. L. GARBER.

Look On The Other Side

I was going down street the other day, and looking up, saw a sign, which read; Ninety-nine, forty-four per cent pure. The question came up, what is pure, it might be sugar, or salt, flour or tea, but it did not say, only one thing was said: Ninety-nine fourty-four per cent pure, I thought, that is very pure, almost absolutely pure. If man was that near pure, his wings would soon be seen.

I walked a little ways and looked back at the sign, and read the words ivory soap, so the secret was revealed, it was soap that was so near perfection, only this and nothing more. What a good thing there is something so near being absolutely pure, but I had to get on both sides of the sign to find the explanation.

Here is a lesson for us, look on both sides before drawing conclusions, or building theories.

Sometimes men and women see something, or hear something, and then they begin to think something, without learning facts, particulars, or anything about the other side. They may be told something concerning some one, and without waiting to know about the truth or falsehood of the thing, hand it out to some one else, and the lop-sided story goes on its unlawful mission. How much pain and trouble and injustice might be saved if people, before condemning, would take the trouble to look on the other side.

There seems to be a disposition on the part of some people to grab after the sensational, the impure, and the slanders of the world. They may read: Ninety-nine and fourty-four one hundred per cent pure, but they love to think and talk about the other fifty-six per cent, and that is generally enough to set homes and churches on fire with discord. Alas! for poor humanity. As Mrs. Somebody says: "We are all poor critters," and some people are in particular.

But another thing I noticed about that ivory soap sign. Getting in another position, rather in front of the sign. I read the words: "It floats."

After looking on both sides of an assertion or act, it would be well to let it float,

Let it float away to God in prayer, if worth anything it will reach the throne, if it reaches the throne, it will glance back with an answer, as did the prayer of the cup-bearer before the Persian king. Many of the troubles of life might be bottled up by God, if people would only give them to God in place of giving them to poor frail humanity.

"Go bury thy sorrow
The world has its share."

Bury them in prayer. Much of the discords of life might be prevented, if people would pray their complaints in place of playing gossip. I once heard the colored Jubilee Singers sing: "Steal away to Jesus." How much better to steal away to Jesus in prayer, than to pour a load of complaint into the ear of some friend, and have it in turn poured, with variations into the ears of others. Mrs. Brown had the spirit that is right, and which should be cultivated.

"I love to steal awhile away
From every cumbering care,
And spend the hour of setting day
In humble, grateful prayer."

Let it float away into space. If not worth telling to God, it is not worth telling to humanity. Better let the wind have it. Some one has said that there is a point in space where all discordant sounds meet and blend into harmony. I cannot vouch for the truth of this, but the idea is a happy one. Let us leave it stand, and throw out the annoyances of life, and the discordant sounds in life and all those one sided things we get, and let them float out into space, and reach some point where they will become pure.

"There's many a trouble would burst like a bubble,
And into the waters of Leathe depart,
Did not we rehearse it and tenderly nurse it,
And give it a permanent place in the heart."

I admit it is much easier to preach, than to practice, and I will here stop. But do not despise the ivory soap advertisement, there is a lesson in it for all who stop to think.

JOHN DUKE MCFADEN.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Last week was one of beautiful weather in this place, after weeks of cold and wet weather. It afforded a fine opportunity to gather farm crops yet remaining out.

Bro. Brown and Mason have taken hold of the Passover question in great earnest. Now let them discuss it, and the other's judge. We will have no general discussion just yet.

The present is a remarkable period in the existence of this country. While politicians are going to the very dredges of infamy and wickedness, there is developing on the other hand a wonderful inquiry after truth and justice. The forces are being marshalled for a great battle between right and wrong. Right will win in the contest, and America will stand upon a plane of freedom far beyond that ever attained by any nation.

One of the most dastardly acts known was committed on a congregation of German Baptists in Huntington county, Ind., recently. A communion was held, and the evil person someway managed to pour some Croton oil in the soup. The cooks noticed something and skimmed most of it off, yet sufficient was left to make a number very sick.

A writer in the *Reformed Messenger* says this:

An English clergyman, lately joined the Church of Rome, and then wrote a book in which he gives "the plain reason" that had induced him to take such a step. He had been floundering about for a long time, seeking for some solid foundation in the Church of England to stand on, but it was all in vain. One support after another gave way under his feet. He looked for it in the Anglican Church instead of seeking for it in Christ, upon which that Church and every other Christian Church rests.

A writer says:

The so-called Saints' Days took their raise at an early period in the annual commemorations around the graves of the first Christian martyrs. On such occasions the religious services were simple but solemn and impressive, consisting of singing and prayer, the celebration of the Lord's Supper; [Love feast] and a recital of the acts and words of the martyrs in their last sufferings. With sadness and sorrow there was connected a feeling of triumphant joy, and the day of their death was called their birth-day in the new kingdom of glory. Such simple and devout services, however, in the course of time, ran into many excesses of a more or less idolatrous nature. A pagan element here gradually insinuated itself into the cultus of the Christian Church, and identifying itself with the pious reverence of the early Christians for the memory of the martyrs, found in this feeling a suitable nidus for the propagation of its poisonous species, amidst the superstitions of the middle ages.

Miami Valley Items.

The Supper—Passover question is becoming quite prominent. We have, however, one consolation in the controversy that our eternal salvation does not depend upon our endorsement of any of the theories extant.

Bro. P. J. Brown's theory as given in last number should have a careful and fair investigation, and if it will stand the test of Gospel proof, then we will rejoice that the proper solution to this question has at last been given.

The view of our brother is this: That the proper and true time, as ordained by God, for the slaying of the Paschal Lamb was about the very time on which our Savior was crucified, and that the feast was to be eaten that evening. But that the Lord Jesus using his divine power and authority changed the time, so that they (Jesus and his disciples) ate the Passover twenty-four hours before the regular time.

Our brother agrees that as he was "Lord of the Sabbath," he could be "Lord of the Passover," also. Therefore had a right to change the time of the Jewish ordinance.

In accepting this theory we must not forget that Jesus said emphatically. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." We have no instance on record where Jesus changed in the slightest, any God-giving ordinance of the Jews.

We must also notice the circumstance under which we find the assertion that "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." This was said when his disciples were accused of sinning when they plucked and ate the ears of corn on the Sabbath day. As Lord of the Sabbath he was excusing, if not justifying, this violation of the Jewish tradition, and as Lord of the Sabbath he was competent to decide in this matter. But as Lord of the Sabbath he did not change the time or the day, nor did he, in the slightest manner, change any other ordinance specially and positively commanded and named by Jehovah. "He came not to destroy, *but to fulfill*." The fulfillment in this instance was that he was the true antitypical Passover, and was slain at the exact time, as originally designed by God.

I want to call attention to Bro. Brown's remark concerning John's testimony. He says: "And now after years of careful investigation, I am thoroughly convinced that the position we then held as a church, and the same that Bro. Mason still clings to, is absolutely and utterly untenable. Bro. Mason is in the same mist that we were in. He ignores the clear and positive statements of Matthew and Mark as well as the greater part to Luke, and depends altogether on the allusive statement of Johns."

I do not really know that I would or should undertake to discuss this question further; but a few prominent brethren think, as the spokesman of those who hold the views I have explained, I am in duty bound to reply to Bro. Brown's attack on this theory. I wish my old friend had been a little more moderate in his assertions, and a little less sarcastic in his criticism. But brother Brown is a very plain spoken brother, and does not always mean the assertions to be as severe as they really are.

But to return to the quotation just given, I must strongly object to the assertion that my position is "absolutely and utterly untenable." That expression is a little too sweeping and radical. While I am willing to acknowledge that my way of reconciling these apparent contradictions may be open to criticism, and I dare not claim infallibility, but I must insist on the fact that my position is the most reasonable, and has one virtue that it does not contradict or ignore any of the assertions made by John or either or all of the synoptists.

One expression of our brother is somewhat unfortunate as it is liable to mislead and insinuate that, which, in the end, may turn out to be harmful. In the above quotation he uses the expression "the allusive statements of St. John."

"Allusive" means *hinting at—referring to indirectly*. I have only to make the quotations from John, and then leave it to the judgment of the people whether they are hints or indirect references, or, on the other hand, whether they are not strong, positive, uncontradictable statements.

John 13:1 says: "Now *before* the feast of the Passover." Then in verse 29 after having told Judas "that thou doest, do quickly," some thought the Lord said this "because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, buy those things that we have need of against the feast." The feast referred to here was the feast of the Passover, which, of course, according to this, was still in the future. Here was positive evidence the disciples did not recognize this supper as the Jewish Passover. This was not a mere hint brother Brown, but a positive assertion.

Then in John 18:28 we read: "Then led they Jesus from Caiaphas into the hall of judgment; and it was early; and they themselves went not into the judgment hall lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover." This is no mere allusion. Then it must be remembered our brother acknowledges that the Jews were going to observe the feast that night, and that this was the proper scriptural time.

Once more John 19:14 says concerning Pilate in his effort to release Jesus: "And it was the preparation of the passover, and about the sixth hour, and he saith unto the Jews, Behold your king." The day of crucifixion then was the "preparation of the passover."

Lastly, in John 19:30 we are told "The Jews, therefore, *because it was the preparation*, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, (for that Sabbath was an high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away."

I have presented five strong assertions, not mere allusions, that the passover was still in the future at the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. I, for one, consider John's positive testimony too strong to be thrown lightly on one side. Then the assertions of the Synoptists, Matthew, Mark and Luke are not beyond explanation and reconciliation. So have taken the most reasonable grounds to bring this about.

One thing is very strange in this matter. When I first read these passages of scripture and realized the apparent contradiction and difficulty, I repeat that it was rather strange that I should fall into the same channel of explanation that the old brethren had, and as given in Bro. J. W. Beer's book on the Passover. It is only within the last four years that I read the book and saw there in substance my own arguments.

It is true that my first interpretation may not have fully agreed with Bro. Beer on these points, but it was so nearly so that I found no difficulty in dropping the few little differences.

Again, Bro. Brown says of me, "He ignores the clear and positive statements of Matthew and Mark, as well as the greater part of Luke." I must deny this charge and refer our reader to chapter 18, pages 183 and 186 of my book. I explain these passages and not ignore them.

Now comes the disagreeable part of my reply. The article says "Why Bro. Mason calls Matthew, Mark and Luke 'Synoptists,' I am unable to understand, when the fact is they give a straightforward account of the facts as they transpired, and if there is any synopticism in the case, to my mind it is in John's account and not any of the others." I cannot believe that Bro. Brown intended to ridicule me for using a word that had no meaning, neither do I think that he intended to accuse me of treating these evangelists with irreverence, or that I was guilty of pedantry. We are too good friends and have too much respect for each other for that. Yet I must acknowledge I was at a loss for awhile to understand what it implied. I came to the conclusion, had he taken the time to read it over carefully, it would not have appeared as it was. Bro. Brown is a very plain-spoken brother, and often says that which may sound quite differently from what was intended.

The word Synoptists is a very common term used among Bible students for Matthew, Mark and Luke. It has become so common within the last decade that it is impossible to find any prominent work on the New Testament without meeting with the term. So was rather astonished that our brother was unacquainted with the word.

Bro. Brown was again wrong when he accused Mr. Webster of such unpardonable neglect and ignorance. The first dictionary I consulted I found the word in all its glory, and will be found in any of the Supplements of Webster and Worcester.

The word is an anglicized Greek word, the root of which is *sun* together and *optomai* to see, behold, etc. The words optics, optical and optician comes from the same root as *optists*, the latter part of the word. It means a general view or history of any thing or man. Then when the three evangelists give so much of the Lord's history in common—the miracles, discourses and parables, seem to run so much in the same channel—they have the same general view of the Lord's life that they are naturally called Synoptists.

John's gospel is entirely distinct from the others, and does not give a general view of his life, therefore is not a synoptist.

Webster defines Synoptist: "One of the authors of the three synoptical gospels which gives a history of our Lord's life and ministry, in distinction from John's gospel, which gives a fuller account of his teachings."

Worcester defines Synoptists: "One of the writers of the synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke." Then he quotes the following: The first three evangelists agree much in matter and language, and are consequently called synoptists (their gospels the *synoptic gospels*). John stands alone as the ideal and spiritual evangelist who introduces us into the holy of holies."

Philip Schaff.

Then again Bro. Brown says "And hence, instead of calling this memorable meal the 'Last Supper,' a stupid error into which the old painters of which Bro. Mason speaks, as well as nearly everybody else have fallen into, let us call it the *last passover*." This I claim as an argument on our side, for the old painters years ago did not recognize this meal as the passover, but a usual supper. It was his last supper on earth, and so it was called on that account "The Last Supper." We do not believe there is much stupidity here,

We are truly thankful to Bro. Brown for the one grand concession he makes that the real and proper time for eating the Passover was on the evening following the Lord's crucifixion. That settles the one question favorably.

But that Jesus, who so emphatically said that he "came not to destroy," should make a change and violate one of the great laws of the Jews, and in a manner upset the great design of heaven, we cannot accept. By this means the Paschal Lamb would be slain twenty-four hours before the Divinely—appointed time, so the one feature of Christ being our Passover was frustrated, because the type and antitype could not meet on the cross. The time being changed, the literal lamb was already slain before Jesus was crucified. This changing of time made a great balk in the design of fulfillment. The only fulfillment I can see is there was no Jewish Passover that year. They were getting ready but the terrible darkness, earthquake, etc., prevented them. Jesus the true antitype became our only passover, and so *fulfilled* the law.

(*Concluded on last page.*)